**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION**

ETHEL VENICE POGUE,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
V.	§	
	§	
TEXAS WORKFORCE COMMISSION,	§	A-18-CV-713-LY-ML
ET AL.,	§	
Defendants.	§	

<u>ORDER</u>

Before the court are Plaintiff's Complaint (Dkt. #1) and Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* (Dkt. #2). Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and alleges the Texas Workforce Commission and two of its employees violated her rights.

Because Plaintiff is seeking permission to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the court may perform an initial review of the complaint and dismiss the case if the court determines that the complaint is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). The information Plaintiff has provided in the Complaint is insufficient for the court to properly evaluate the Complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) to determine whether Plaintiff states a cognizable claim.

Therefore, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(e), the court **ORDERS** Plaintiff to file a document entitled "More Definite Statement" with the clerk of the court. In this more definite statement, Plaintiff must provide factual support for the allegations against each Defendant by simply stating or including:

(1) What acts each Defendant did that violated Plaintiff's rights;

(2) What rights were violated;

(3) The dates of those violations;

(4) What relief Plaintiff wants from each Defendant; and

(5) Any other information which Plaintiff considers important to the case.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff shall file this more definite statement **on or before September 12, 2018**. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 12(e); *Hanna v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber*, 6 F. Supp. 2d 605, 608 (E.D. Tex. 1998). A failure to do so will result in this court's recommending dismissal of Plaintiff's Complaint for want of prosecution.

SIGNED August 22, 2018

_____
MARK LANE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE